

REMARKS

In the November 30, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending in the application; objected to the disclosure due to a failure to find Figure 6; rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, Japanese Published Patent Applications 6-103306 to Sukehiro et al. and 5-2603 to Tanabe (References AH and AI, respectively, in the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 1, 2001) were cited. Claims 12-16 have been cancelled and thus, claims 1-11 remain in the case. The Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed below.

Objection to Drawings

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because Fig. 6 is discussed on page 17 of the application, but no Fig. 6 was found in the drawing sheets. The Examiner's attention is directed to sheet 3 of the drawings as published in United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0029442 which includes Fig. 6. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

In items 3-8 on pages 2-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sukehiro et al. The remaining independent claims have been amended to recite "a translation option" which in claim 1 is "corresponding to the respective specified units" (claim 1, line 4) and "translating the text using the translation option" (e.g., claim 1, last line). In rejecting claim 12, it was asserted that Sukehiro et al. disclosed generation of translation options in one or more of paragraphs 18, 19 and 23 and "translating ... separate units of text based on the corresponding translation options" in paragraph 23. Nothing has been found in the English translation of paragraphs 18 or 19 regarding translation options, therefore, only paragraph 23 will be discussed below.

According to the English translation submitted on May 1, 2001, in paragraph 23 Sukehiro et al. describes file management means 22 as "detecting the operating conditions of all translation executing means 51 to 53" (page 9, lines 3-4) and determining "to which translation executing means the divided original sentence should be transmitted" (page 9, lines 7-8). While this might be considered translation control, it is not clear what the Examiner believed was "translation control information" as previously recited in claims 1 and 5-10 and no suggestion has been found that the divided original sentence is transmitted to translation executing means so that the translating can be based on translation **options** as now recited in various ways in the

independent claims. In other words, nothing has been found in the English translation of Sukehiro et al. that there is anything the selection of the translating means by the file management means relates in any way to an **option** in how translation is performed.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 and 5-10, as well as claims 2-4 and 11 which depend from claims 1 and 10, patentably distinguish over Sukehiro et al.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3/30/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 3/30/2005
By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Date: 3/30/05
STAAS & HALSEY